

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	$k_{\mathcal{I}}$				
		Application No.	Applicant(s)		$ \overline{}$
		10/805,791	SHEKARRIZ ET	AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		Minh-Chau T. Pham	1724		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence ac	idress	
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIOnsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication experiod for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, and period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by streply received by the Office later than three months after the need patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a n. a reply within the statutory minimum of the eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC tatute, cause the application to become A	n reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered time NTHS from the mailing date of this on NBANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status			•		
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on				
	•	This action is non-final.			
3)□	·		tters, prosecution as to the	e merits is	
<i>,</i> —	closed in accordance with the practice und	•	•	- 1-	
Disposit	ion of Claims	•		,	
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the applica	tion.			
,,	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with				
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
	Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are rejected.				
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction ar	nd/or election requirement.			
Applicat	ion Papers	·			
	The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner		•	
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		hy the Evaminer		
٠٠/	Applicant may not request that any objection to		•		
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co		• • •	ER 1 121/d\	
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	•		` '	
	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			. 0 .02.	
_	_	oian priority under 25 LLS C	\$ 110(a) (d) ar (f)		
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore  ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	eigh phonty under 35 0.5.C.	9 119(a)-(a) or (1).		
a)	1. Certified copies of the priority docum	ante have been received			
	Certified copies of the priority docum     Certified copies of the priority docum		Application No		
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the			Stage	
	application from the International Bu		ii received iii tiiis Nationai	Stage	
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a		t received		
•	action and actions of the action for a	not of the certified copies no	r received.		
Attachmen	t(e)				
	τ(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Intervious	Summary (PTO-413)		
	e of Neterences Cited (F10-692) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	) — Paper No	(s)/Mail Date		
3) 🛛 Infori	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB	(/08) 5) Notice of	Informal Patent Application (PT	O-152)	
Pape S. Patent and T	r No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/14/04</u> .	6)	<u> </u>		
PTOL-326 (R		e Action Summary	Part of Paper No./N	1ail Date 0812	Λ
					<b>V</b> (
					Ţ

Application/Control Number: 10/805,791

Art Unit: 1724

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Call et al (6,120,573), in view of Wurz et al (6,051,041).

Call et al disclose a microimpactor system comprising a fluid conduit having a plurality of rows of microimpactors (12) arranged in the fluid conduit substantially transverse to a main direction of flow of fluid (16) through the fluid conduit, wherein the microimpactors (12) in at least two successive row are offset from each other (13a, 13b, 13c, col. 5, lines 4-10). Call et al further disclose the fluid conduit including a fluid inlet (42) and a fluid outlet (46 in Fig. 3B), means for moving fluid (58) through the system (col. 9, lines 25-34), and means for applying an electrical charge to the at least one

Page 3

Art Unit: 1724

microimpactor (col. 13, line 47 through col. 14, line 10). Claims 1-10 differ from the disclosure of Call et al in that the microimpactor system has specific spacing configuration i.e. spacing between adjacent microimpactors within a row from about 3 to about 20 times the microimpactor width, and the spacing between adjacent rows of microimpactors is from about 3 to 20 times the microimpactor width. Wurz et al disclose the optimal relation of spacing of the microimpactors of one row and spacing of the microimpactors of adjacent rows in a formula e/s = 0.3-0.7 wherein s = spacing of the microimpactors of one row and e = spacing of the microimpactors of adjacent rows, and especially good results are achieved if e/s is 0.5 (see col. 3, lines 9-42, col. 4, line 40 through col. 5, line 35). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the optimal spacing structure of the microimpactors as taught by Wurz et al in the microimpactor system of Call et al to provide a separating means which enables an especially simple design of the separator with an especially high efficiency and with especially low energy consumption.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh-Chau T. Pham whose telephone number is (571) 272-1163. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon/Tues/Thur/Fri 7:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duane Smith can be reached on (571) 272-1166. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/805,791 Page 4

Art Unit: 1724

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Minh-Chau Pham Patent Examiner

Art Unit: 1724 August 12, 2005